UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,518	03/24/2006	Yoon Ho Song	CU4737RJS	5106

26530 7590 03/10/2010

LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER	
HOLLWEG, THOMAS A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,518	SONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas A. Hollweg	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-19 and 21-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-19 and 21-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement of Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. Applicant's amendment of November 18, 2009, is acknowledged. Claim 6 is canceled. No claims are added. Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-24 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

2. The following claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. Amended claim 1 reads "wherein the field emission-inducing gate portion is adapted to induce electrons to be emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied to the metal mesh in a direction of the field emitter, and the field emission-suppressing gate portion is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode". It is understood that both the metal mesh of the field emission-inducing gate electrode and the field emission-suppressing gate electrode apply an electric field or contribute to the electric field near the field emitter when voltage is applied to these electrodes. Amended claim 15 reads "an electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode." Claims 1 and 15 describe an electric field applied to electrodes, rather than the electric field generated by or applied via electrodes. The Examiner believes that the electric fields in the above quoted limitations are fields applied via rather than fields applied to the electrodes, and the claim will be interpreted in this way.

b. Claim 15, the word "emitter" in the phrase "adapted to prevent the electrons emitter" is a misspelling of the word "emitted".

c. Claim 15, "the electric field applied to the meal mesh" lacks antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. Paragraph [46] found on page 6 of the Specification reads "an electric field is applied to a direction of the field emitter 130... in the metal mesh 320" and "An electric filed is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode 230". Paragraph [55] found on page 7 of the Specification reads "an electric field is applied to the field emission-inducing gate electrode" and "an electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode". The Examiner believes that these passages describing electric fields "applied to" or "applied in" an electrode does not accurately describe the function of the field emission device. It is well understood that in field emission devices, the electrodes function to generate or contribute to the electric field in the vacuum space above the electron emitter to cause emission of electrons and to control the path of freed electrons toward a target. Electric fields are generally not "applied to" the electrodes. As a comparison, paragraph [76], found on page 10, of the specification reads "the electric field necessary for the field emission is applied via the metal mesh of the field emission-inducing gate portion". The Examiner

believes that the "applied via" language of this paragraph more accurately describes the function of the electrodes in the device and suggests that "applied via" or similar language is used in place of "applied to" when describing the relationship between the electrodes and the electric field.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12-18, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Janning, U.S. Patent No. 5,955,833.

6. **With regard to claim 1,** in figure 2, Janning discloses a field emission device (10') comprising: a cathode portion having a substrate (30'), a cathode electrode (22') formed on the substrate (30'), and a field emitter (12') connected to the cathode electrode (22'); a field emission-suppressing gate portion (26') formed on the cathode portion around the field emitter (12') and surrounding the field emitter (12'); and a field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) formed on top of the field emission-suppressing gate portion (26') having a metal mesh (26a) with at least one penetrating hole (28a) that surrounds electrons (29') being emitted from the field emitter (12'), and a dielectric layer (40a) surrounding the side of the metal mesh (26a) in the penetrating hole (28a) and adapted to prevent the electrons emitted from the field emitter (12') from directly

colliding with the metal mesh, wherein the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) is adapted to induce electrons to be emitted from the field emitter (12') when an electric field is applied via the metal mesh in a direction of the field emitter, and the field emission-suppressing gate portion is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied via the field emission-suppressing gate electrode in a direction opposite to the elected field applied to the metal mesh (col. 5, line 3 - col. 6, line 11), and wherein the field emission-suppressing gate portion (26') is electrically insulated (24a) from the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a), and has an insulator (24') with a field emission-suppressing gate opening (28') therein, and a field emission-suppressing gate electrode (26') formed on the insulator (24') (col. 5, lines 19-22).

7. The Examiner notes that the claim limitations "wherein the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) is adapted to induce electrons to be emitted from the field emitter (12') when an electric field is applied via the metal mesh in a direction of the field emitter" and "the field emission-suppressing gate portion is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied via the field emission-suppressing gate electrode" are drawn to a method of operating the claimed field emission device and does not further limit the structure of the device explicitly. The claim limitation has been considered, however, absent a showing that the structure of the device is further limited, this method of operation limitation cannot distinguish the claimed device over Janning (see MPEP 2114).

8. **With regard to claim 2,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the dielectric layer (40a) of the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) is formed on an entire surface or a portion of the surface of the metal mesh (26a) (col. 5, lines 56-64).

9. **With regard to claim 4,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the penetrating hole (28a) of the metal mesh (26a) has at least one inclined inner wall (col. 5, line 64-66).

10. **With regard to claim 5,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the dielectric layer (40a) covers the inclined inner wall of the penetrating hole (28a) (col. 5, lines 60-61).

11. **With regard to claim 8,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the inner wall of the metal mesh (26a) includes a protrusion having at least two inclined angles (one on either side of the hole; col. 5, lines 56-64).

12. **With regard to claim 9,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the metal mesh (26a) of the field emission-inducing gate portion (26) is a metal plate formed of one of aluminum, iron, copper and nickel, or an alloy plate containing at least one of stainless steel, invar and kovar (col. 5, lines 42-45; col. 5, lines 64-66).

13. **With regard to claim 12,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the field emitter (12') is formed of a thin or thick film formed of one of diamond, diamond like carbon, carbon nanotube, and carbon nanofiber (col. 3, lines 36-40).

14. **With regard to claim 13,** the examiner notes that the claim limitation "the field emitter is formed by directly growing any one of diamond, diamond like carbon, carbon nanotube, and carbon nanofiber on the cathode electrode using a catalytic metal" is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a

process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation has been considered but is not patentably distinct over Janning (See MPEP 21113).

15. **With regard to claim 14,** the examiner notes that the claim limitation "the field emitter is formed by printing a paste containing any one of powder type diamond, diamond like carbon, carbon nanotube and carbon nanofiber" is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation has been considered but is not patentably distinct over Janning (See MPEP 21113).

16. **With regard to claim 15,** in figure 2, Janning discloses a field emission display device (10') comprising: a cathode portion including cathode electrodes (22') and field emission-suppressing gate electrodes (26') arranged in a stripe form (col. 5, lines 14-15) to allow matrix addressing to be carried out and insulated (24') from each other on a substrate (30'), and pixels defined by the cathode electrodes, and wherein each pixel having a field emitter (12') connected to the cathode electrode (22'); a field emission-suppressing gate portion (26') having an insulator (24') with a field emission-suppressing gate opening in a field emission-suppressing gate of the cathode portion formed on a region around the field emitter (12') in the form of surrounding the field emitter (12') that surrounds electrons (29') being emitted from the field emitter (12'); a field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) having a metal mesh (26a) and formed on top

of the field emission suppressing gate portion (26') with at least one penetrating hole (28a) allowing electrons (29') emitted from the field emitter (12') to pass therethrough, and a dielectric layer (40a) surrounding the side of the metal mesh (26a) in the penetrating hole (28a) and adapted to prevent the electrons emitted from the field emitter (12') from directly colliding with the metal mesh (26a) ; and an anode portion having an anode electrode (16') and a phosphor (18') connected to the anode electrode (16'), wherein the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) is adapted to induce electrons (29') to be emitted from the field emitter (12') so that the electrons (29') emitted from the field emitter (12') collide with the phosphor (18') via the penetrating hole (28a), and the field emission-suppressing gate portion (26') is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter (12') when and electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode (26') in a direction opposite to the electric field applied to the meal mesh (col. 5, line 3 - col. 6, line 11).

17. The Examiner notes that the claim limitations "the field emission-inducing gate portion is adapted to induce electrons to be emitted from the field emitter" and "the field emission-suppressing gate portion is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter when and electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode in a direction opposite to the electric field applied to the meal mesh" are drawn to a method of operating the claimed field emission device and does not further limit the structure of the device explicitly. The claim limitation has been considered, however, absent a showing that the structure of the device is further limited, this method

of operation limitation cannot distinguish the claimed device over Janning (see MPEP 2114).

18. **With regard to claim 16,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the cathode portion, the field emission-suppressing gate portion (26'), the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a), and the anode portion are vacuum-packaged such that the field emitter (12') of the cathode portion is opposed to the anode electrode (16') of the anode portion via the field emission-suppressing gate opening (28') and the penetrating hole (28a) (col. 4, lines 56-66; col. 5, lines 56-64).

19. **With regard to claim 17,** examiner notes that the claim limitation "a constant direct current voltage is applied to the field emission-inducing gate portion to induce electron emission from the field emitter of the cathode portion, and a scan signal having a negative voltage is input to the field emission-suppressing gate portion and a data signal having a positive or negative voltage is input to the cathode portion to display an image" is drawn to a method of operating the claimed field emission display and does not further limit the structure of the device explicitly. The claim limitation has been considered, however, absent a showing that the structure of the device is further limited, this method of operation limitation cannot distinguish the claimed device over the Janning (see MPEP 2114).

20. **With regard to claim 18,** examiner notes that the claim limitation "a pulse amplitude or a pulse width of the data signal is modulated to represent a gray scale" is drawn to a method of operating the claimed field emission display and does not further limit the structure of the device explicitly. The claim limitation has been considered,

however, absent a showing that the structure of the device is further limited, this method of operation limitation cannot distinguish the claimed device over the Janning (see MPEP 2114).

21. **With regard to claim 21,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the cathode portion, the field emission-suppressing gate portion (26'), and the field emission-inducing gate portion (26a) are opposed to the anode portion using a spacer (20') as a support (col. 4, line 64).

22. **With regard to claim 22,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the dielectric layer (40a) is formed on an entire surface or a part of the surface of the metal mesh (26a) (col. 5, lines 6—61).

23. **With regard to claim 24,** in figure 2, Janning disclose that the penetrating hole (28a) of the metal mesh (26a) has at least one inclined inner wall (col. 5, lines 56-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 3, 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janning as applied to claims 1, 6 and 15 above, in view of itself.

26. **With regard to claim 3,** Janning discloses all of the limitations, except it does not expressly disclose the dimensions of the holes or the thicknesses of the various electrode and insulating layers.

27. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the field emission device disclosed by Janning operates based on the electrical fields generated between the various electrodes, and the effectiveness of these fields to create an image is related to the physical dimensions of the electrodes and surrounding layers, including thicknesses of the layers, shape of the electrodes and dimensions of the holes through which the electrons travel. It has been held that where the general limitations of the claim are taught by the prior art, discovering an optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955)).

28. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning field emission device where the dimensions of the electrodes and insulators are optimal, such that a largest cross-section of the penetrating hole of the field emission-inducing gate portion is not greater than one time to three times a thickness sum of the metal mesh and the dielectric layer.

29. **With regard to claim 7,** Janning discloses all of the limitations, except it does not expressly disclose the dimensions of the holes or the thicknesses of the various electrode and insulating layers.

30. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the field emission device disclosed by Janning operates based on the electrical fields generated between the various electrodes, and the effectiveness of these fields to create an image is

related to the physical dimensions of the electrodes and surrounding layers, including thicknesses of the layers, shape of the electrodes and dimensions of the holes through which the electrons travel. It has been held that where the general limitations of the claim are taught by the prior art, discovering an optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955)).

31. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning field emission device where the dimensions of the electrodes and insulators are optimal, such that a largest cross-section of the field emission-suppressing gate opening is one time to twenty times a thickness of the insulator.

32. **With regard to claim 23,** Janning discloses all of the limitations, except it does not expressly disclose the dimensions of the holes or the thicknesses of the various electrode and insulating layers.

33. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the field emission device disclosed by Janning operates based on the electrical fields generated between the various electrodes, and the effectiveness of these fields to create an image is related to the physical dimensions of the electrodes and surrounding layers, including thicknesses of the layers, shape of the electrodes and dimensions of the holes through which the electrons travel. It has been held that where the general limitations of the claim are taught by the prior art, discovering an optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955)).

34. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning field emission device where the dimensions of the electrodes and insulators are optimal, such that a largest cross-section of the field emission-suppressing gate is equal to or smaller than one time to twenty times a thickness of the insulator layer.

35. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janning as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, in view of Ge, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0000771 A1.

36. **With regard to claim 10,** Janning discloses all of the limitations, however it does not expressly disclose that the field emission-suppressing gate portion is divided into a plurality of openings, wherein the penetrating hole of the field emission-inducing gate portion is one per unit pixel.

37. Ge, in figure 5, teaches a field emission device (250) where the field emission-suppressing gate portion (252) is divided into a plurality of openings, wherein the penetrating hole of the field emission-inducing gate portion (252) is one per unit pixel [0018, 0030].

38. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning device where that the field emission-suppressing gate portion is divided into a plurality of openings, wherein the penetrating hole of the field emission-inducing gate portion is one per unit pixel, as taught by Ge, to allow for a display with a finer pitch.

39. **With regard to claim 19,** in figure 2, Janning discloses that the anode portion is composed of a transparent substrate (14'), transparent electrodes (16') formed on the transparent substrate (14'), and phosphors (18') (col. 4, lines 56-64) that may be individually addressed (col. 3, lines 64-67).

40. Janning does not expressly disclose that the phosphors are red (R), green (G) and blue (B) colors formed on a predetermined region of each transparent electrode, and a black matrix formed between the phosphors.

41. Ge, in figure 4, discloses a field emission device having an anode portion composed of a transparent substrate (12), transparent electrodes (32) formed on the transparent substrate (12), and phosphors of red (R), green (G) and blue (B) colors (33) formed on a predetermined region of each transparent electrode (32), and a black matrix formed between the phosphors (33) [0021-0022] so the device may operate as a high contrast full color display for displaying desired images [0009-0010].

42. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning field emission device where phosphors of red (R), green (G) and blue (B) colors are formed on a predetermined region of each transparent electrode, and a black matrix is formed between the phosphors so the device may operate as a high contrast full color display for displaying desired images, as taught by Ge.

43. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janning as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Okamoto, U.S. Patent No. 5,850,120.

44. **With regard to claim 11,** Janning discloses all of the limitations except it does not expressly disclose that a size of the penetrating hole in the metal mesh is larger than that of the field emission-suppressing gate portion opening.

45. Okamoto, in figure 9, teaches a field emission device where a size of the penetrating hole in the metal mesh (33) is larger than that of the field emission-suppressing gate portion (32) (col. 10, lines 40-65).

46. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Janning device where a size of the penetrating hole in the metal mesh is larger than that of the field emission-suppressing gate portion opening, as taught by Okamoto, so that the electrons from several emitters can be accelerated toward the anode by the potential of a single field emission-inducing gate, simplifying design.

Response to Arguments

47. Applicant argues that the prior art reference Janning does not teach or suggest the claim limitation of "a dielectric layer surrounding the side of the metal mesh in the penetrating hole and adapted to prevent the electrons emitted from the field emitter from directly colliding with the metal mesh". Applicant concedes that the dielectric layer of Janning (40a) surrounds the side of the metal mesh (26a), but argues that because the dielectric layer (40a) is intended to generate secondary electron emission that "it is desired in Janning to have more electrons colliding with the metal mesh (26a) or the enhanced layer (40a)". The Examiner agrees that it may be desired in Janning to have more electrons colliding with the dielectric enhanced layer (40a), but there is no support

for the assertion that is desired in Janning to have more electrons colliding with the metal mesh (26a). As clearly shown in Janning figure 2, the dielectric layer (40a) covers all of the surfaces of the metal mesh (26a) which may otherwise be collided with by electrons, including the inside surface of the penetrating hole, similar to Applicant's dielectric layer of shown in figure 4 of the present application. It is clear that the purpose of the dielectric layer in both figure 2 of Janning and figure 4 of the present application, is to prevent the emitted electrons from directly colliding with the metal mesh by causing the electrons to collide with the dielectric layer instead.

48. Applicant further argues that Janning does not teach or suggest the emission suppressing and the emission inducing functions of claim 1. This argument is not convincing for two reasons. First, as noted by Applicant, the cathode (22'), the first grid (26'), the second grid (26a) and the anode (16) of Janning figure 2 are labeled "+", "-", "++", and "++", respectively. This is the exact same driving configuration described in the present specification, paragraph [56], found on page 7, which reads "the field emitter 130 is grounded, a positive voltage is applied to the field emission-inducing gate electrode 320 and a negative voltage is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode 230." The description of the driving configuration of Janning described in Applicant's arguments on page 13, which reads "in Janning the first dynode (26') shall be maintained positive with respect to the cathode (22') and the second dynode (26a') shall be at a more positive electrical potential than the first dynode (26')" is unsupported. It is noted that although Janning uses the word "dynode" to emphasize the secondary electron feature of the electrode coatings (40), the Janning device is a traditional field

emission device and the two grid electrodes (26' and 26a) are field emission display grid electrodes and function as such.

49. Second, the limitations added to claim 1 which read "wherein the field emission-inducing gate portion is adapted to induce electrons to be emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied to the metal mesh in a direction of the field emitter, and the field emission-suppressing gate portion is adapted to suppress electrons from being emitted from the field emitter when an electric field is applied to the field emission-suppressing gate electrode" is functional language drawn to a method of operating the claimed field emission device and does not further limit the structure of the device explicitly. It is well established that absent a showing that the structure of the device is further limited, that a method of operation limitation cannot distinguish the claimed device over the prior art (see MPEP 2114). Janning discloses all of the structural limitations of claim 1 and one having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the Janning device could be driven so that the first grid electrode functions to suppress electron emission and the second grid electrode functions to induce electron emission.

50. Lastly, Applicant agues that Janning does not disclose that "the field emission-suppressing gate portion is electrically insulated from the field emission-inducing gate portion, and has an insulator with a field emission-suppressing gate opening therein, and a field emission-suppressing gate electrode formed on the insulator". This argument is not understood. Both Janning figure 2 and the present figures have an insulator (Janning 24') (present 210) having a field emission-suppressing gate opening and on

which is formed the field emission-suppressing gate electrode. It is noted that this limitation is different from the limitation recited in the now canceled claim 6.

Conclusion

51. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

52. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

53. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Hollweg whose telephone number is (571) 270-1739. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm E.S.T..

54. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

55. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TH/

/NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2879